

October 29, 2008
FCS Study Group
Meeting One Summary (10/29/08)
10 a.m. – 4 p.m.

- I. Welcome/Introductions
 - a. Members Present: Jane Smilie, Julie Benson-Rosston, Joe Russell, Shannon Therriault, Jerry Cormier, Jennifer Pinnow, Susan Brueggeman, Tim Roark, Laurel Riek, Shannon Mc Donald, Howard Reid
 - b. Absent: Cam Shipp
 - c. Others Present: Rick Larson ; John Rolich
- II. Opening Comments from Jane Smilie—Jane discussed the history of the formation of the FCS Study Group.
- III. Examination of Agenda—Julie Benson-Rosston led this discussion—Made a few adjustments/deletions/additions, according to group needs
- IV. Chris Deveny’s Report—Jane reviewed the highlights from this report.
- V. Joan Miles—Joan visited briefly to express her thanks and support for the group. She emphasized the Department’s commitment to this process.
- VI. “Voice from the Field”—Rick Larson, Silver Bow County
- VII. Public Comment Period—John Rolich from Silver Bow County
- VIII. FCS Study Group Process—Julie provided an overview of the larger framework in which the group will be working and discussed her role as facilitator. **See Graphic at the bottom of this summary.
- IX. Ground Rules: Julie led a discussion about what the “Ground Rules” for communicating with each other should be:
 - a. Focus on the issues—not people: No name calling or personal criticisms
 - b. Consider the FCS System, not just the state section
 - c. Keep on track
 - d. Try not to be defensive
 - e. Be honest and straightforward
 - f. Respect all ideas
 - g. No “sidebar” conversations
 - h. Only one person speaks at a time—That person has the “floor” until s/he is done
 - i. Listen to each other
 - j. Be cognizant of nonverbal behaviors (eye-rolling, sighs, talking under your breath, defensive postures, etc.)
 - k. Appreciate differing viewpoints without consequences
 - l. Don’t undermine the group while not in the group
 - m. Strive for consensus
 - n. Do not speak for others if they are not present, unless you have permission to do so (e.g. someone asks you to present an idea/ask a question, etc.)
- X. Discussion of Group Membership—The group discussed whether or not the current group membership includes all appropriate and representative stakeholders. Many expressed that there is not adequate “Eastern” representation or “small county” representation. The group agreed this will be

partially addressed by Cam Shipp's inclusion. Additional discussion regarding "missing" stakeholders included agencies like DEQ and QAD, but the conclusion was that the group should proceed as currently configured. However, as work progresses there may be interest in expanding the group.

- XI. The group discussed the "charge" of the group, its membership, and began a rough draft of roles/responsibilities. This took a lot of time, and the group suggested it be included in the next meeting's agenda, as well.
 - a. Purpose of the Group: The Food and Consumer Safety Study Group will complete a comprehensive review of and make recommendations for improvements to the statewide food and consumer safety system, including, but not limited to:
 - i. Statutes and rules
 - ii. Funding
 - iii. Data systems
 - iv. Local-State Relationships
 - v. Capacity
- XII. Requests for Additional Information: The group identified several documents/reports/updates that would help them do their job. These included:
 - a. 10 Essential Services
 - b. Budget of State FCS
 - c. DPHHS Structure—Organizational Chart
 - d. IT Hardware and Software---What is the state using?
 - e. Resources of FCS—Examples included legal counsel and information technology
 - f. Information regarding how money flows from One-Stop and FCS (Presentations by Barb Sliva and Rochelle (from Dept. of Administration))
 - g. Written report from Barb re: a written description of how payments rule are determined for inspections
 - h. Report from Federal level activities (30 minute overview from Joe Russell)
 - i. Draft of Environmental Public Health Performance Standards
 - j. Non-public water supply group
 - k. Copy of statutes and rules
 - l. Reports—Legislative audits, previous examination of program, etc.
 - m. Presentations from DEQ and QAD
 - n. Local budgets—Ellen's Report
- XIII. Next Meetings: The group scheduled the next two meetings—December 3, 2008 and January 8, 2009
- XIV. Suggestions for next meeting's Agenda: Review of purpose and ground rules; more discussion on roles/responsibilities, group membership; communication processes; goals (short-term, mid-term, long-term), budget and local board inspection funds; Met Net with Larry Gostin, hard copies of statutes
- XV. Evaluation of Meeting: The group discussed what went well during the day and what could be improved for next time.
 - a. Strengths: Facilitator, Ground rules
 - b. Suggestions for improvement: Better food

